1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	No. 1:15-cr-10271-WGY
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
7	
8	VS.
9	
10	ALEX LEVIN
11	
12	****
13	
14	For Jury Trial Before:
15	Judge William G. Young
16	
17	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston.) One Courthouse Way
19	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Wednesday, May 29, 2019
20	
21	*****
22	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
23	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
24	One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
25	

```
A P P E A R A N C E S
 1
 2
 3
    ANNE PARUTI, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
       One Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
 4
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3310
 5
       E-mail: Anne.paruti.lohnes@usdoj.gov
 6
       For the United States of America
 7
    J.W. CARNEY, JR., ESQ.
 8
    DANIEL J. GAUDET, ESQ.
       J.W. Carney, Jr. & Associates
 9
       20 Park Plaza, Suite 1405
10
       Boston, Massachusetts 02116
       (617) 933-0350
11
       Email: jcarney@carneydefense.com
       for the defendant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
I N D E X
1
2
3
  WITNESS
         DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
4
5
  ALEX LEVIN (Continued.)
6
   By Mr. Carney: 4
                        23
7
   By Ms. Paruti:
                   10
8
 JOSEPH NICHOLLS (Recalled.)
10
  By Mr. Carney: 25
11
   By Ms. Paruti:
                   34
12
13
 MOTIONS/CHARGE CONFERENCE......4
 14
15 l
 16
17
 JUDGE'S CHARGE TO JURY...... 72
 18
19
20
21
            EXHIBITS
22
            (None marked.)
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
                (Jury enters, 9:30 a.m.)
 3
                THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and
     gentlemen. I hope you all had a very meaningful
 4
 5
     Memorial Day weekend. I do thank you, as I have
 6
     throughout the trial, most sincerely, and I mean this,
     you were all here right on time, and we didn't get
8
     started on time, and it's no one's fault. If I knew
 9
     whose fault it was, I would tell you. What happened was
10
     there was a severe train accident south of Boston,
11
     someone got killed, and that caused buses to be delayed
12
     and we were not all here. It's nobody's fault.
13
     Everyone's here now. We're ready to go.
14
           Would you remind the witness.
15
                THE CLERK: I'd like to remind you, sir, that
16
     you are still under oath.
17
           Do you understand?
                THE WITNESS: I do.
18
19
                THE COURT: And you were inquiring?
20
                MR. CARNEY: Yes, I was, your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: You may proceed.
22
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you.
23
24
     DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CARNEY: (Continued.)
25
     Q. Good morning, Mr. Levin.
```

A. Good morning.

1

9

- Q. I'd like to go back to ask you a few more questions about your employment history.
- From 2010 until 2015, where were you working?
- A. In 2010 I was self-employed as a project manager, a
 Program Technical Project Manager.
- 7 MR. CARNEY: You'll have to keep your voice up 8 and move closer to the microphone.
 - THE COURT: Yeah, the mic will move to you, so pull that closer to you, so it's comfortable.
- 11 A. In 2010, I was -- is that good?
- 12 THE COURT: That's better.
- 13 A. Yes, in 2010, I was self-employed as a Technical
- 14 Program and Project Manager, I worked in health care,
- 15 um, in the health care industry, the insurance
- 16 companies. From 2014 and on -- 2013 to 2015, I was
- 17 | employed at Bank of America as a --
- 18 Q. And what did you do at Bank of America?
- 19 A. I was a Technology Program Manager there.
- 20 Q. Okay. And what does a Technology Program Manager
- 21 do?
- 22 A. He manages a portfolio of different projects,
- 23 technical projects.
- 24 Q. All right. And that's where you were working in
- 25 2015?

- A. Correct.
- 2 Q. I asked you on Friday about the file-sharing
- 3 programs, Shiraza and Frostwire. Do you recall that?
- 4 A. I do.

- 5 Q. And you told the jury that it was possible to, um,
- 6 obtain a single file from a host computer?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. Where you could download a kind of file from the
- 9 host computer, is that right?
- MS. PARUTI: Objection.
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 MR. CARNEY: That's my last question leading
- 13 | up to today's testimony.
- 14 THE COURT: Yeah, well it is both leading, and
- it may be leading up to today, so I'll let the answer
- 16 stand. And now briefly go from there.
- 17 Q. Could you repeat your answer?
- 18 A. Correct, you can download one file or multiple
- 19 files.
- 20 Q. All right. Mr. Levin, did you ever employ "drive
- 21 sweeping" or "disk sweeping"?
- 22 A. I have.
- 23 Q. Would you explain to the jury please what "drive
- 24 sweeping" is?
- MS. PARUTI: Objection.

```
THE COURT: Sustained. We've been over this.
 1
 2
                MR. CARNEY: We went over this on Friday? I
 3
     mean on --
                THE COURT: Yes, on the last day of sitting we
 4
 5
     went over it, and he testified. And he testified, just
 6
     so we're clear and I'm clear, you testified to occasions
     where when someone had made their drive available, in
8
     fact you swept a drive, is that right?
                THE WITNESS: That's correct.
 9
10
                THE COURT: So you've done that?
11
                THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
                THE COURT: About how many times?
12
13
                THE WITNESS: Um, multiple times. I couldn't
14
     give you the exact number, but many times.
15
                THE COURT: All right.
           Go from there.
16
17
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you.
         Were you using the drive sweep in 2011?
18
     Q.
19
     Α.
         Yes.
20
         Had you been using it before then?
21
     Α.
         Yes.
         And when did you stop doing drive sweep?
22
23
         Probably in 2012.
     Α.
24
     Q.
         Why did you stop?
25
         Um, using peer-to-peer file-sharing software became
     Α.
```

1 irrelevant, most of the material is now available on the 2 internet. 3 What material are you specifically referring to? Concert footage -- most of the concert footage. 4 5 Also crypto-currency mining software. 6 What is crypto-currency mining software? It's the software that generates, um -- probably 8 everybody heard of Bitcoin. Bitcoin is a type of 9 crypto-currency. So that's what it is. 10 Q. Is Bitcoin accepted at any stores that you know of 11 today? 12 MS. PARUTI: Objection. 13 THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. Let's 14 focus on this case. 15 It's perfectly appropriate for you to inquire that 16 he used to obtain such data, but whether it's accepted 17 or you can invest in it, or things like that, we're not going there. 18 19 In 2011, was Bitcoin legal? 20 A. Yes. 21 MS. PARUTI: Objection. THE COURT: Well, we'll let that stand. 22 23 Now you've indicated that you stopped using

Frostwire in about 2012?

A. Correct.

24

```
Do you know what, um, a "wild card" is?
1
 2
     Α.
         Yes.
 3
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
                THE COURT: How do you know?
 4
 5
                THE WITNESS: (Silence.)
 6
                THE COURT: How do you know?
 7
                THE WITNESS: Well it's a widely-used term.
8
     Technology basically allows you to enter a part of a
9
     search string and everything within that search string
10
     that matches will come out. That's called a "wild
11
     card."
12
                THE COURT: All right.
           Go ahead.
13
14
     Q. How is that different from a "drive sweep"?
15
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
                THE COURT: Well he's just told us.
16
     A. So a "drive sweep" --
17
                THE COURT: No, I'm going to sustain that
18
19
     objection.
20
                THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
21
                THE COURT: You just told us that was
     different, didn't you?
22
23
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
24
                THE COURT: Yeah. All right.
25
     Q. At any time, Mr. Levin, did you knowingly possess
```

```
the 13 child-porn videos and photographs in this case?
1
 2
     Α.
         No.
 3
     Q. Did you ever know it was on your hard drive?
     A. I did not.
 4
 5
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you. That's all I have,
 6
     your Honor.
 7
                THE COURT: Do you wish to examine? Proceed?
 8
                MS. PARUTI: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.
 9
10
     CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PARUTI:
11
     Q. Good morning, Mr. Levin.
12
     A. Good morning.
13
     Q. Can you hear me?
14
     A. Yes.
15
     Q. All right. So you said that you used peer-to-peer
16
     software from the late 2000s to the early like 20-teens
17
     or so?
     A. Correct.
18
19
         So you're saying now 2012 is when you stopped using
20
     file-sharing software?
     A. Yes.
21
22
        Because at that point that's when you started to
23
     find things that you wanted in other sources, correct?
24
     A. Correct.
25
```

Q. For example, the internet, correct?

- A. Correct. "Archive.net," that's for most of the concert footage.
- Q. Okay, so you could use the internet to find the
 stuff that you previously had to go to other users who
 had private collections, correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- Q. All right. And that's what -- that's why you used the peer-to-peer software, correct, to get things that other people have that you do not have on your own computer, correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. You said that you used Shiraza and Frostwire. What other peer-to-peer file-sharing
- 14 programs did you use?
- 15 A. I probably started from the original Napster. I 16 used Minera. I used Bit Torrent, like Torn -- Torn
- Gods. I used multiple file-sharing, um, things.
- Q. Okay. And Napster, you said was the original. That started earlier than the 2000s, correct?
- 20 A. Right.
- 21 Q. That started in the '90s?
- 22 A. Probably, yes.
- Q. So it's fair to say that you actually had been using
- 24 it for a little longer than the late 2000s, correct,
- 25 when you started with Napster?

- 1 A. Correct. But I really started using it a lot in the
- 2 late 2000s, early 2019.
- Q. Okay. And in the late 2000s, that's when you had
- 4 the computer we've been talking about in court for the
- 5 past week or so, um, you got that computer in 2009,
- 6 correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And you bought that new and you installed Windows in
- 9 December of 2009, correct?
- 10 A. I bought it new and Windows was already installed on
- 11 it.
- 12 Q. Okay. And nobody else used it but you, right?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. And you used that for personal things, right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And, um, did you use that for your work as well or
- 17 | did you have a dedicated work computer?
- 18 A. I used it marginally for work, mostly to keep my
- 19 CDs, home movies, my resumes, things like that. But
- 20 occasionally for work. But typically I would use
- 21 dedicated work computers for work.
- 22 Q. Okay. So you kept that computer, that HP laptop at
- 23 your home and you used that at home, correct?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 Q. And in fact you had a docking station on your desk,

```
correct, when the FBI came in 2015?
 1
 2
     A. I think so, yes.
 3
                MS. PARUTI: And actually can we, um, show
     exhibit -- yes, Exhibit 10, please.
 4
 5
                (On screen.)
         So the laptop we've been talking about, I'm circling
 6
     the one under the desk, that was your older laptop,
8
     correct?
 9
     A. Yes.
         And there was one -- when the FBI agent executed the
10
11
     search warrant at your house on August 12th of 2015, you
12
     had your newer or your current laptop on the desk,
13
     correct?
14
     A. Correct.
15
     Q. And that's what I've just circled in red on the
16
     screen?
17
     A. Yes.
     Q. And that -- on the day of the search when they took
18
19
     those pictures, it was actually in that docking station
20
     so you could use a bigger screen, is that correct?
21
         It was either a docking station or a cooling pad.
22
     Q. So it was a cooling pad and it was hooked up to a
23
     bigger screen, so that you could use the bigger screen
24
     while you used your laptop?
25
         Correct. The laptop itself was hooked up to the --
```

Α.

- 1 that's not a docking station, it's just a cooling fan.
- 2 Q. Right, but the point is that you're using this
- 3 bigger screen, correct, and then this keyboard to access
- 4 the data in that laptop, correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. All right. Now, when you used your older laptop,
- 7 | did you also use it in that manner?
- 8 A. For the most part, yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. And it was also portable, right, so did you
- 10 ever bring it with you to places?
- 11 A. Um, if I traveled -- yeah, usually I traveled with
- 12 my work computer, so rarely.
- 13 Q. Okay, so it was under your control in your home and
- 14 you said you were the only one who used it, is that
- 15 correct?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 Q. All right. Now, you said that when you were using
- 18 those different peer-to-peer file-sharing programs, they
- 19 all worked in similar ways, correct?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. All right, meaning that you can -- if you want
- 22 | something, for example like a Grateful Dead song, you
- 23 can type in, into the file-sharing program that's on
- 24 your computer, type in "Grateful Dead," right?
- 25 A. Correct.

- Q. And that might return thousands of Grateful Dead songs?
 - A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Or Grateful Dead videos?
- 5 A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Or any other type of file that has Grateful Dead in
- 7 it, correct?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. And if you wanted to, you could select every single
- one of those results to download to your computer
- 11 through that peer-to-peer file-sharing software,
- 12 | correct?
- 13 A. If I wanted to.
- 14 Q. Or you could take that time, when you had them sort
- of filtered there, and you could go through and say,
- 16 "Oh, you know what? I already have that fifth song, so
- 17 I don't want to waste time downloading that, I'm just
- 18 going to take Number 1, Number 20, and Number 50,"
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. I could either do that or I can look at the user who
- 21 was making those files available, and if I know that
- 22 that user could download material that I select, I could
- 23 select everything from there and sweep the whole drive.
- 24 Q. Because you know that person, you have familiarity
- 25 with downloading from that particular user on the

- network, correct?
- 2 A. Correct.

- 3 Q. And you know how to navigate the peer-to-peer file-
- 4 sharing software, right, because you've been using it
- 5 for years, and you have, to be honest, advanced sort of
- 6 technical expertise, correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- Q. And it doesn't take a software engineer to use this
- 9 peer-to-peer file-sharing, correct?
- 10 A. Yeah, it's not difficult.
- 11 Q. It tells you it has an interface, or something that
- 12 the user is looking at, and it makes it easier for
- 13 people to use to understand what it is and how to use
- 14 it, correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. All right. Now, um, you said that you used that
- computer for some work-related stuff, and one of those
- 18 things you mentioned was your resumes, and that's
- 19 | something you had actually been working on for years,
- 20 correct?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. And with each job that you went to or were applying
- for as an independent contractor, you would update your
- 24 experience and you would put your experience in your
- 25 resume so that you could advertise yourself potentially

```
to employers, correct?
1
         Correct.
 2
 3
     Q. And you made your living in the past, I think you
     said more than 20 years maybe, in some field of either
 4
 5
     technology or information technology or some sort of
 6
     software-related, computer-related expertise, correct?
         Correct.
                   Technology for the most part.
8
     Q. Technology for the most part. Okay.
           You were talking about the "wild card," and just
 9
     so we're clear about that, you said you could put a wild
10
11
     card in so that you could just look for a portion of a
12
     word and it would bring up other types of files or
13
     documents or whatever that included that, correct?
14
     A. Correct.
15
         Is that usually denoted by like a star or an
16
     asterisk?
17
     A. Correct.
18
     Q. Okay.
19
                THE COURT: I guess I then didn't understand
20
     your earlier answer and maybe Ms. Paruti did.
21
           Is that what you put in for a wild card, a portion
     of a word?
22
23
                THE WITNESS: A portion of the word followed
```

THE COURT: Okay.

by a, um, wild card or an asterisk.

```
Go ahead.
1
                MS. PARUTI: So if we could just have Exhibit
 2
 3
     26 up, please. (On screen.) And we'll look at Page --
     Page 9, please. (On screen.) Okay, highlight 48,
 4
 5
     please. (Highlighted.) Okay.
 6
         So do you see what's on the screen there, sir?
     Α.
         I do.
8
        Okay. And do you see that asterisk and then it says
     ".wmv"?
9
10
     A. Yes.
11
         Okay. Is that, if you were using a wild card to
12
     search, is that what you mean you would do, the asterisk
13
     and then whatever portion of the file name or properties
14
     that you wanted to show up?
15
         It is, though typically that's not how I would use
     the wild card.
16
17
     Q. But that's how you could do it, correct?
18
     A. Yes.
19
     Q. And that's what it really means, the asterisk means
     anything else that comes before that is attached,
20
21
     correct?
22
     A. Yes.
23
                MS. PARUTI: Please clear that, please.
24
                (Screen cleared.)
25
     Q. Now when you do a "drive sweep" of somebody else's
```

- drive, they have to enable that, correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. All right. So if you wanted to give other people
- 4 access to your files, when you're using file-sharing
- 5 software, you can choose only things in a specific
- 6 folder, correct?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. So, for example, you could say "I want to share
- 9 anything in my pictures folder, " correct?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. And you tell the program "only give people access to
- 12 that," right?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 Q. Or you could say, "I want to give people access to
- 15 | my entire computer," and the file-sharing software would
- 16 allow that, correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. And now by doing that, you're giving access
- 19 to literally anything that's on there, correct?
- 20 A. A user can do that. I never shared anything on my
- 21 computer.
- 22 Q. Oh, you never shared anything on your computer,
- 23 right?
- 24 A. What I was using, it was purely anonymous, and I
- 25 didn't even register to sharing anything.

- Q. Okay, so that means that you could get access to other people's things, but they couldn't get access to your things?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Now, you would agree with me, wouldn't you, that if you were doing a drive sweep of somebody -- well actually just look at this.

Can you tell how big their drive is when you decide to do a drive sweep of somebody else's drive?

A. Um, no.

4

8

9

10

15

16

- Q. You can't. So you're just kind of guessing it could be somebody with a terabyte-sized drive?
- A. It could be as little as a dozen files, it could be as many as hundreds of thousands of files.
 - Q. Okay. And so you don't know that when you click -when you tell the software to do the drive sweep,
 correct?
- 18 A. No, I don't believe there was an indication of the size of their drive.
- Q. Okay. So when you choose to do that -- when you
 chose to do that, you would have no idea whether it was
 going to take 10 minutes to download the stuff you
 needed or two days, correct?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. Because you would agree with me, wouldn't you, that

- for a smaller number of files, it would take much less 1 2 time than to download a drive that was as large as, for 3 example, your computer's hard drive, correct? 4
 - Α. That's correct.
- 5 And then when you would do a drive sweep, you'd still then afterwards -- afterwards, excuse me, you 6 would have to go through your entire hard drive and find 8 the things that you wanted, correct?
- I would go to the folder that I designated, 9 typically that I designated for the drive to come down 10 11 to and then I would look for what I needed.
- 12 Okay. And you can do that by searching your own 13 computer, correct?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 And you can actually go through and you can look at 16 the folder and click to open any subfolders that 17 downloaded, correct?
- A. You could do that, correct. 18
- 19 Or you could just do a search and type in the words 20 that you know of, correct?
- A. Correct. 21
- Q. And because you know, if you're typing in a word 22 23 into your Windows search function, that Windows will do 24 that searching for you rather than you having to 25 manually do it and go through it, correct?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. And then you said that you would delete everything
- 3 | else that you didn't want?
- 4 A. Not very often. When I get to it, occasionally, I
- 5 | would. But I wasn't very meticulous about it.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 A. Should I have been? Yes.
- 8 Q. Okay. So you would download -- how often would you
- 9 say you would drive sweep?
- 10 A. I mean I couldn't tell you the exact number, but
- 11 once -- once a week. And I'm approximating it.
- 12 | Q. So once a week you're drive sweeping and you told us
- 13 the other day that 99 percent of the stuff that you
- 14 actually wanted or were looking for was Grateful Dead
- 15 music, correct?
- 16 A. 90 percent.
- 17 Q. 90?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. And all the rest you were looking for was
- 20 music?
- 21 A. The rest were either movies or crypto-currency
- 22 mining software.
- 23 Q. Okay. And you would drive sweep people's drives who
- 24 you knew had good collections of that stuff, correct?
- 25 A. From prior experience, yes.

```
Q. Okay. But you would do that once a week and you
1
 2
     would drive sweep the same people or you would find new
     users who also had collections that you were interested
 3
     in?
 4
 5
         It would typically be either new users or users that
     I would see it's the users that I've done before, and
 6
     use that.
8
     Q. (Pause.) And you said you stopped using the peer-
     to-peer software in 2012?
 9
10
     A. Yes.
11
                MS. PARUTI: No further questions.
                THE COURT: Anything further for this witness?
12
                MR. CARNEY: Please, your Honor.
13
14
15
     REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CARNEY:
16
     Q. Mr. Levin, I just want to ask you about wild cards.
17
           You stated, in answer to the prosecutor's
     question, that using an asterisk is one way to use wild
18
19
     cards, is that right?
     A. That's correct.
20
21
                MR. CARNEY: Now could we see, your Honor,
     Exhibit -- Exhibit 26, Page 9, highlighted on Item 48,
22
23
     please. (On screen.) Thank you.
24
     Q. The prosecutor used this as an example of a wild
25
```

card. Do you remember that?

```
1
     Α.
         Yes.
         And, um, to your knowledge and experience, is that
 2
 3
     the only way to put in a wild card?
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: No. Well I'm going to sustain
 6
     that particular question, but I'll ask, is that one way
     to put in a wild card?
8
                THE WITNESS: It's one of many ways to use a
     wild card.
 9
10
                THE COURT: Okay, that's my question. Now you
11
     ask yours, Mr. Carney.
12
     Q. How do you do it, if you want to do a wild card
13
     sweep?
14
         What I would typically do is type in "HDGD" --
15
     standing for "High-Definition Grateful Dead," and then
16
     "wild card" or the date I was looking for. But I would
17
     typically start the wild card, it would be after a
     string of characters.
18
19
         Thank you.
     0.
20
                MR. CARNEY: That's all I have, your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Nothing further for this witness,
     Ms. Paruti?
22
23
                MS. PARUTI: No.
                THE COURT: All right.
24
25
           Does the defense rest or do you want to recall the
```

```
witness who --
 1
 2
                 MR. CARNEY: I want to recall the witness,
 3
     your Honor.
 4
                 THE COURT: You may step down, sir. And he
 5
     may be called for the purpose we discussed.
     Mr. Nicholls.
 6
                 MR. CARNEY: And he may be sitting outside,
 8
     your Honor.
 9
                 THE COURT: Yes.
                 (Mr. Nicholls enters.)
10
11
                 (Witness recalled.)
                 THE CLERK: I'd like to remind you, sir, that
12
     you are still under oath. Do you understand?
13
14
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
15
                 THE CLERK: All right, you may be seated.
16
                 THE COURT: Mr. Carney.
17
                 MR. CARNEY: Thank you.
18
                 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
19
20
                 JOSEPH NICHOLLS
                 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
21
22
23
     DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CARNEY: (Recalls witness.)
24
     Q. Would you reintroduce yourself to the jurors,
25
     please.
```

- Joseph Nicholls. 1 Α. 2 And you testified in this case last week? 3 T did. Α. I wanted to ask you about one other area. 4 5 Are you familiar with the phrases "drive sweep" or "disk sweep"? 6 7 Α. I am. 8 Q. What do they refer to? 9 MS. PARUTI: Objection. THE COURT: Overruled. 10 11 They refer to going through a -- the formal name is 12 "hard disk drive," and it gets abbreviated "hard drive" 13 or "hard disk" and so on, but it's going through one of 14 those storage devices and looking at every file on that 15 storage device. 16 Q. Whose storage device, in your example, are you 17 looking at? 18 MS. PARUTI: Objection. 19 THE COURT: No, he's just giving us an example 20 of how computers work and he may do so. But I'm not
- THE WITNESS: I understand where it's going.
 There's a little bit more.

sure I understand that question.

Do you understand it?

21

22

THE COURT: All right, if you can answer it,

```
1
     tell us, if you're going to do one, whose computer, not
     particularly, but what computer you're looking at?
 2
 3
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
         For what's relevant to this case, it has to do with
 4
 5
     peer-to-peer sharing and, um, when we say "drive
     sweeping" or "disk sweeping," we're talking about a
 6
     user, let's called it Computer 1, that wants to receive
8
     data from a remote computer called -- let's call it
 9
     Computer 2. And so the person sitting at Computer 1
10
     that wants to receive the files, that person is doing
11
     the "disk sweeping." The disk that is being swept is on
12
     Computer 2, the computer that is sharing the data.
     Q. What does a "disk sweep" capture on the other
13
14
     person's computer, on Computer 2?
15
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
16
                THE COURT: Overruled.
17
         The "disk sweep" would be all the files that are on
     Computer 2, the computer that's sharing, all the files
18
19
     come down to the computer that is requesting the data,
20
     Computer 1 in this example.
21
     Q. Can a person sweep an entire hard drive of the
22
     Computer 2?
23
         The sweeping depends on what the Computer 2 user set
24
     up and allowed to be shared, and there are various ways
25
     to do that.
```

```
THE COURT: So that I can follow it, the user
1
 2
     of Computer 2 sets the parameters?
 3
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                THE COURT: And sets what's permitted to be
 4
 5
     swept?
 6
                THE WITNESS: That's correct.
 7
                THE COURT: Within those parameters, under a
 8
     peer-to-peer file-sharing program, the user of Computer
     1 can "sweep" or download all those files?
 9
10
                THE WITNESS: Correct.
11
                THE COURT: All right.
12
         Are you aware of instances where a person, we'll
     call him Computer 2, makes available his entire hard
13
14
     drive or her entire hard drive?
15
                MS. PARUTI: Objection, your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: Sustained to that question.
17
     Q. Are you aware of instances where a person allows his
18
     entire hard drive to be swept?
19
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
                THE COURT: No, sustained. I've permitted him
20
21
     to testify that it apparently can be done, um, but I
22
     don't know if he can give us such instances, and even if
23
     he can, I don't know why they're relevant, so.
24
                MR. CARNEY: Your Honor, I submit that this
25
     evidence is relevant because it will show --
```

THE COURT: No, don't arque. 1 MR. CARNEY: Can I make an offer of proof? 2 3 THE COURT: You may. 4 5 AT THE SIDEBAR THE COURT: Go ahead. 6 7 MR. CARNEY: Your Honor, if the witness were 8 allowed to answer, I would expect he would say the following. He's very familiar with instances of a 9 10 person allowing his entire hard drive to be swept by 11 someone else. I submit that that evidence is relevant 12 because that's what my client said he did, shared --13 downloaded entire hard drives. It's admissible because 14 my --15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MR. CARNEY: Because the person is an expert 17 and can testify, with his expertise, about whether he knows that people will sometimes make their entire hard 18 19 drive available. 20 THE COURT: I don't --21 Do you object? 22 MS. PARUTI: Yes, I do. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 All right. Now while we're here, this is going 25 smoothly, you're about done with him, right?

```
MR. CARNEY: Yes, your Honor.
 1
                THE COURT: Then you'll rest, that's it?
 2
 3
                MR. CARNEY: Yes.
                THE COURT: That's fine.
 4
 5
                (In open court.)
 6
 7
                THE COURT: In view of my ruling, anything
8
     else?
9
                MR. CARNEY: Yes. May I have a moment, your
10
     Honor?
11
                THE COURT: You may.
12
                (Pause.)
     Q. Mr. Nicholls, can you explain what, quote, "user
13
14
     access," end quote, means related to the accessed
     section of files?
15
16
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
17
                THE COURT: No, that goes beyond what I said
     he could be recalled for. Sustained.
18
19
                MR. CARNEY: May I approach, please, your
20
     Honor?
21
                THE COURT: No, I don't think so.
           Anything else?
22
                MR. CARNEY: I'm trying to ask this expert the
23
24
     questions that the jury asked.
25
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
```

THE COURT: Well whatever you're trying to do,

I said he could be recalled for a specific reason, and

now he's gone over that reason. That's my ruling.

Q. Mr. Nicholls, if you open and delete a file, would

there still be a link file created?

MS. PARUTI: Objection.

THE COURT: No, sustained. But I see what you're doing here and, um -- (Pause.) And I think I'm going to allow it. But you'll allow me to put the juror questions. So we'll go back.

As one of the jurors inquired, since we have you now on the stand, sir, can you explain user access related to the accessed sections of files?

THE WITNESS: Um, the access that we've just talked about are the dates that a file was used, and as we talked about the last time, you know sometimes the file can be used and displayed on the screen, and for a convenience we'll say it opens the file and the human sitting there can see what's on the screen. But at other times, as we talked about indexing, for example, the file is used and, um -- but it's only the computer, a human can't see what was in the files when it's used that way. Now both of those will cause the last accessed date to be updated on this computer.

THE COURT: Can a file be accessed and not

```
I think you've just answered that?
 1
     opened?
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
 2
 3
                THE COURT: And your answer is "Yes"?
                THE WITNESS: The answer is "Yes."
 4
 5
                THE COURT: I see.
 6
                THE WITNESS: Where we say "open" means that
 7
     the user sees it on the screen.
8
                (Pause.)
                THE COURT: All right. Now I've asked those
 9
10
     questions, but, um, you may follow up.
11
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you.
12
     O. When is a link file created?
13
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
14
                THE COURT: Overruled. He may have it.
15
         There's many reasons a link file gets created, but
16
     one of the reasons is that the user opened it and it's
17
     displayed on the screen and a link file is saved on the
     computer for convenience.
18
19
         If you open and delete a file, will there still be a
20
     link file created?
21
     A. Yes, that the link file gets created when the file
     is open. What happens after that, the link file doesn't
22
23
     get involved in.
24
     Q. Can a file be created on the server, given an access
25
     time date, and not or never be opened?
```

```
MS. PARUTI: Objection.
 1
                THE COURT: Do you understand that question?
 2
 3
                THE WITNESS: I don't, and the use of the term
     "server" in this context.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: All right, then I'm going to
 6
     sustain the objection.
 7
                MR. CARNEY: All right.
8
     Q. If a file is downloaded to a computer, can it never
9
     be opened by a user?
10
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
11
                THE COURT: No, now we're sufficiently beyond.
     You're sustained.
12
13
                MR. CARNEY: Your Honor, may I direct your
14
     attention to the final question on Page 1 of the jurors
15
     questions.
16
                MS. PARUTI: I renew my objection, your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: I understand, and I'm standing on
     my ruling. Sustained.
18
19
           Anything further for this witness?
20
                MR. CARNEY: (Pause.)
21
     Q. Now, Mr. Nicholls, can you explain how Bitcoin was
22
     used in regards to peer-to-peer sharing?
23
                MS. PARUTI: Objection.
24
                THE COURT: No, no, sustained.
25
           Look, I understand the jurors asked that question,
```

```
but I ruled that's irrelevant. Sustained.
1
     Q. All right, Mr. Nicholls, thank you for your
 2
 3
     testimony.
                THE COURT: Anything for this witness,
 4
 5
     Ms. Paruti?
                MS. PARUTI: Just very briefly, your Honor.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: All right, you may.
8
     CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PARUTI:
9
10
     Q. Mr. Nicholls, you said -- you told us the last time
11
     and you told us again here today, that a link file is
12
     created when a user opens a file, correct?
13
     A. Correct.
14
     Q. That link file is a shortcut to the target file,
15
     correct?
     A. Correct.
16
17
     Q. So when we say "open," we mean it's up on the screen
     and the user can see it, correct?
18
19
     A. Correct.
20
     Q. Okay. And you said the link file tells us nothing
21
     about what happened to that target file after it leaves
     the computer, correct?
22
23
     A. (Pause.) "Leaves the computer," meaning?
24
     Q. So it could be deleted, right?
25
     A. Yes.
```

```
Q. Or it could be transferred to a thumb drive,
1
 2
     correct?
 3
         Which is really a delete, yes.
     Q. So we use the term "delete" just to mean we're
 4
 5
     taking it off of one place and this one place is this
 6
     defendant's computer, correct?
     A. Yes.
8
     Q. Thank you.
 9
                MS. PARUTI: Nothing further.
                THE COURT: Nothing further for this witness,
10
11
     Mr. Carney?
12
                MR. CARNEY: Correct, your Honor.
                THE COURT: You may step down.
13
           Does the defense rest?
14
15
                MR. CARNEY: Yes, the defense rests, your
16
     Honor.
17
                THE COURT: You may step down. Thank you.
           All right, ladies and gentlemen, now you have
18
19
     heard all the evidence you're going to have in this case
20
     and we appear to be on track. We're going to take a
21
     15-minute recess now, I need to talk to the lawyers
22
     about legal matters.
23
           There are two most important parts of the case
24
     that remain. The lawyers will sum up the evidence that
25
     you've heard and I will explain in detail the law that
```

```
1
     you must follow. These are important parts of the case,
 2
     so you should not now, and do not, start talking about
 3
     the case. Still, though you've now heard all the
     evidence, keep your minds suspended, do not discuss the
 4
 5
     case either among yourselves, nor with anyone else.
 6
     may stand in recess for 15 minutes. The jury may
 7
     recess.
8
                THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
 9
                (Jury leaves, 10:10 a.m.)
                THE COURT: You have a motion, Mr. Carney?
10
11
                MR. CARNEY: Yes, I do, your Honor. I move
     for a directed verdict of not guilty.
12
13
                THE COURT: The motion is denied, but your
14
     rights are saved, and the matter may be renewed
15
     following the verdict.
16
           Has Ms. Gaudet given you copies of the verdict
17
     slip, it's very simple.
                MR. CARNEY: Yes, your Honor.
18
19
                THE COURT: And here's how I propose to
20
     charge. And in essence we're going to give the jury
21
     copies of this verdict slip. And I'm going to go over
22
     now, as I reflect on it, the four elements.
23
           Well before I do that, um, you know -- well
24
     Ms. Paruti, I don't think, has heard me charge, but the
25
     general charge is always the same. I start with
```

recalling the jury to their duty, focus them on the evidence. I tell them that I am not the source of evidence. I tell them they must follow my charge.

I talk about the various sources of evidence in a case. In this case the sources of evidence are, as I see it, four-fold. There's a stipulation as to, um, in the interstate commerce aspect. There's the judicial admission in the defendant's opening. There is the oral evidence and there is the -- or rather the testimonial evidence. And there is the evidence of, um, the various exhibits. I go over each one of those.

I do not call the witness "experts," though you may. In my charge I say that certain witnesses, by background, training, and experiences, are allowed to give their opinions about certain things that's happened in this case. I say that they may accept those opinions, but of course they may reject them, and they should look at the basis of those opinions.

I give sort of a stock charge on how they evaluate the testimony of witnesses. I explain they may draw reasonable inferences, but may not guess or speculate.

I do not define "reasonable doubt," but I mention it emphatically.

At this stage I tell them that I'm going to make mention of a couple of things that are not evidence and

I will compliment you all, and it's a sincere compliment, by the way you have tried the case. Then I tell them to disregard it, because you were not there and you, as lawyers, do not know.

Likewise I tell them to disregard anything they may think about how I have managed or presided over the case and I tell them I have no view about how the case will come out, which is entirely the case.

Then we get to the guts of it, and I think there are four elements, and I'm going to refer them to the verdict slip, and I'm going to make mention of the elements in reverse order.

The interstate commerce element is stipulated and the stipulation is an exhibit and the exhibit number is what? Can anyone tell me?

(Pause.)

MS. PARUTI: 16.

THE COURT: Thank you. Then I will say that that's stipulated and make mention as to what a stipulation is.

Child pornography. I will say it was admitted that certain files, um, are -- are in fact child pornography, and those are exhibits what?

MS. PARUTI: Exhibit 17, um, has -- is a disk that contains 13 files of child pornography.

THE COURT: And those files are it. All right. Fine.

And then I will say -- and I will again, despite the judicial admission in the opening, which I will tell the jury they certainly can accept, I think it's the better part of valor to go over the statutory definition of child pornography and I will do it as I did in my precharge.

Then I will say "Well of course he's got to possess the child pornography," and that's not admitted, and you must look -- I will tell the jury that they can, but are not required to, find the possession of the child pornography, by its existence, on a computer used and apparently only used by Mr. Levin. And then I will back up to "knowingly" and say that this is completely disputed and it largely depends upon what you believe from the evidence. I don't intend to go into it.

The defense has made a request for a specific charge, um, I will not give it, but at the same time I don't expect the government to make any mention of that thumb drive or to suggest there are other instances, what's in evidence is in evidence.

Let's see. Saying I won't give it, Mr. Carney, you'll be sure to renew it, because I will invite you to the sidebar after the -- after I give the charge, and

Ι

that's the time to take objection to the charge and renew any objection.

As for closings, each side gets a half an hour. don't think you should take it, but that's the trial practice advice, and you're welcome to it. The rules stipulate that the government goes first and then the defense. The government gets rebuttal. Rebuttal, Ms. Paruti, has to be real rebuttal, not a second charge, and in my mind that's like 2 minutes of stemwinding rhetoric, whatever it is you want to say, but if you go beyond 2 minutes, it better be "He said this, but remember that." It's got to be absolute rebuttal and I'll start crowding you if it isn't.

All right. I think we ought to take a recess so you can get ready for final argument.

Yes, Ms. Paruti, first.

MS. PARUTI: I'm sorry, your Honor.

You, in your precharge, you also -- I just want to draw your attention to the elements of the crime. The indictment charges an additional -- essentially an enhancement in that it alleges that at least one of the files shows a prepubescent child or a child under 12. I know that you mentioned that during your precharge, I just want to make sure that you do that again during this charge.

```
THE COURT: I did mention it --
 1
 2
                MS. PARUTI: You did.
 3
                THE COURT: -- but I thought the way we had
     agreed -- is it a statutory enhancement, it has to be --
 4
                MS. PARUTI: Statutory, yes, your Honor.
 5
 6
                THE COURT: Very well.
 7
                MS. PARUTI: So it's pled in the indictment
8
     and --
 9
                THE COURT: I will mention it, that that is
10
     something that has to be proved. It's admitted, but it
11
     has to be proved.
12
           All right.
13
                MS. PARUTI: The other question I just wanted
14
     to raise, which I raised briefly at sidebar, is that
15
     obviously I did not know that there would be an
     admission and I told -- to the fact that child
16
17
     pornography was there and that it was child pornography,
18
     and I advertised pretty extensively in a significant
19
     amount of detail to the jury that they were going to see
20
     this evidence, this is how they were going to do it.
21
     just want to make sure that the Court --
22
                THE COURT: I'm going to say they'll have it,
23
     they'll have the ability to view it, they may view it,
24
     here are the requirements. They're just to be aware
25
     that there was that admission in the opening.
```

```
MS. PARUTI: I just don't want them to hold it
 1
 2
     against me as if there was some adverse ruling.
 3
                THE COURT: Actually I don't see how they can.
                MS. PARUTI:
 4
                            Okay.
 5
                THE COURT: But you listen to the charge and
 6
     if you think there's something more I could say, I'll be
 7
     open to it.
8
                MS. PARUTI: The only other, um, request I
     wanted to make was about the limitations of the
 9
10
     defendant's closing. I noticed in opening that he
11
     referenced the defendant's criminal history, which I
12
     would absolutely never expect Mr. Carney to do. So I
13
     don't expect him to knowingly go into information that's
14
     not proper for closing, but given that it already
15
     happened, I think it bears on --
16
                THE COURT: He's not going to do it and I'll
17
     be alert to it.
18
           All right, Mr. Carney.
19
                MR. CARNEY: I have one request, your Honor.
20
                THE COURT: Yes.
21
                MR. CARNEY: Will you be reading from the
     patent jury instructions the definition of "knowingly"?
22
23
     It reads "knowingly" --
24
                THE COURT: Wait a minute.
25
                MR. CARNEY: I can give it to you.
```

```
THE COURT: Actually if you have one --
1
 2
                MR. CARNEY: Yes, I have it.
 3
                (Hands up.)
                THE COURT: Yeah. (Reads.) Yes, I will so
 4
 5
     charge.
 6
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you.
 7
                THE COURT: All right. Let's recess till
8
     10:30. We'll start right at 10:30. We'll recess.
                THE CLERK: All rise.
9
10
                (Recess, 10:22 a.m.)
11
                (Resumed, 10:30 a.m.)
                THE COURT: Come to the sidebar.
12
13
14
                AT THE SIDEBAR
15
                THE COURT: (Reads.) Well --
16
                MS. PARUTI: My objection is to the last
17
     three, only the last three, evidence of how he spoke
18
     about the videos with anyone, that he showed anyone else
19
     or that he sent them to anyone. Those are -- there's no
20
     evidence either way. Mr. Carney didn't, or Mr. Gaudet,
21
     didn't ask any law enforcement about that.
22
           Secondly, and more importantly, it's irrelevant to
23
     whether or not he possessed the material in question.
24
     He would have been charged with an additional crime.
25
                THE COURT: I understand he would have been
```

```
charged. Now it passes the relevance test, but the fact
1
 2
     is that this is not part of the government's burden, so
 3
     you may use them, but for the last three.
                MR. CARNEY: May I be heard on that, your
 4
 5
     Honor?
 6
                THE COURT: Very briefly.
 7
                MR. CARNEY: What I'm trying to suggest is
8
     evidence that if it existed, it could have corroborated
9
     the government's case.
                THE COURT: No, but there is no burden on the
10
11
     government to come up with that evidence.
12
                MR. CARNEY: I understand.
13
                THE COURT: It's not like a missing witness
14
     thing. And so you can't have it. That's the Court's
15
     ruling.
16
                MR. CARNEY: Can I argue that there were no --
17
                THE COURT: No, you cannot. There's no
     evidence either way. We'll stick to what evidence there
18
19
     is. That's the ruling.
20
21
                (In open court.)
22
                THE COURT: Now we've come to the point now
23
     where we give the lawyers the chance to make their
24
     closing arguments. This is the attorney's chance to
25
     stand before a jury of Americans and argue the client's
```

cause, and it's a vital part of the case. So if the arguments help you better understand the case, that's what they're designed to do. If the arguments persuade you or create doubts in your mind, that's what they're intended to do. But just remember this. The lawyers weren't there, the lawyers themselves don't know. The lawyers must argue from the evidence that you have and we all have seen and heard, that's what they're arguing from. So if the lawyer says something and your memory of the evidence or your interpretation of the evidence is different, your interpretation governs, not what a lawyer says.

Now because it's the government here that bears the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, the government gets a chance to make its argument first.

Ms. Paruti.

MS. PARUTI: Thank you, your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. PARUTI:

When the FBI showed up at the defendant's apartment on August 12th of 2015 to execute a search warrant, that is how he, Alex Levin, the defendant, described the extent of his computer knowledge and expertise, "Average." They told him they were conducting an investigation into the internet and they

asked him what he used the internet for? "E-mail."

This is coming from a person who described himself as a "seasoned IT professional" who included "securing corporate assets from cyber attacks" among his career accomplishments and identified "overseeing the delivery of large complex technology programs covering software development and IT infrastructure" among his professional experience. "Average."

That was some of the first evidence you heard in this trial we started just last week, words that came directly from the defendant. The question for you to contemplate today is why would somebody with this type of experience, the defendant, with his professional experience, tell the FBI that he was just average? You don't need an advanced degree to know the answer to that question, common sense tells you the answer. You all have it and you all will need to use it when you go back there to deliberate. Common sense tells you that he said that because he had something to hide.

And as we learned over the course of this trial, boy did Alex Levin have something to hide, in fact he had 13 things to hide. I'm talking about 12 videos and 1 picture of child pornography distributed among three different folders in the hard drive of his computer, the computer sitting right under his desk.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me be clear. There is no dispute that the defendant had child pornography on that computer. is no dispute that it was his computer. There is no dispute that he was the only person who used that computer. Child pornography was in a folder -- well one of the folders labeled "Incomplete," which was a subfolder of one labeled "Shiraza," which we know is peer-to-peer file-sharing software. It was in another folder named "Frostwire," which again we know is associated with peer-to-peer file-sharing software. it was in a third folder also named "Incomplete." is not incidental, it's not accidental, this is not one file that slipped through during a drive sweep of somebody else's random files on their computer, this is 13 separate files in folders all associated with downloading from the internet.

Now when you open Exhibit 17, which is the disk that contains the child pornography that was found on Alex Levin's computer, you will see these files, you will see the titles as they're reproduced from the exhibits you saw in court. Some of these file names leave nothing to the imagination, some of them have titles that, as Mr. Nicholls conceded last week, looked like they contained hash values, remember the digital fingerprint of files that peer-to-peer file-sharing

software uses to identify files to share from one user to another. This, ladies and gentlemen, this child pornography, is what Alex Levin had to hide when he told the FBI, on August 12th, 2015, that his computer knowledge and experience was average and that he used the internet for e-mail.

We -- you, the finders of fact in this case, you now know that back on that date, on August 12th of 2015, those statements were not true, and you know that because the evidence shows you that. The defendant's HP laptop computer contained evidence of way more technical know-how and expertise, sophistication, and dexterity, than he let on on that date.

The evidence shows you, for example, that he was using TOR, and you heard that was the internet browser and the network that allows online activity to be anonymous and that facilitates access to the dark web. You have heard, through Mr. Levin himself when he testified to you from the witness stand, that he was using the internet and products from the internet to mine Bitcoin, virtual currency, some digital money essentially, and that he even went so far as to buy a server to do that, that's what that Attorney General Office's complaint is, that you had asked about, that's at Exhibit 36, and you'll be able to look at that and

you'll be able to read the words that were exported in a document form from his computer when the FBI looked at it. The point is that this is no sort of tech-averse dinosaur, this is a technology professional who is trying to throw the FBI off his scent.

But now that the evidence of his criminal behavior is here, in court, out in the open, right before you, and will be back with you in the jury room, he has tried, when he took the stand, to explain to you what it is and to explain it away. You do not need to accept that explanation, and in fact if you look at the evidence, that evidence tells you that you should not accept that explanation, and your common sense tells you that that explanation makes no sense.

The defendant would have you believe that in order to find concert footage from other people on the internet, he would download their entire hard drives once a week for music, that he would use file-sharing software, which in and of itself allows people -- the very point of which is to allow people to pick what they want to look for, to put in search terms for specific songs or concert venues or dates of shows so that we can narrow and filter their results before they take it from somebody else, use space, and download it to their own drives. But instead of doing that, which is the point

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the software he was using and has been using for years, he told you that he would connect to somebody who had good music, which presumably he had already obtained, and download every single thing on that person's computer. Again, common sense rules the day.

Why on earth would anybody ever go about looking for something specific that they wanted in that very broad and blind way? The answer is they wouldn't. does not make sense. And you know that because you're human beings who function in society. Common sense tells you that it is inconceivable that if you wanted a Grateful Dead song and you have the ability to search the entire pool of people working or sharing on the same network as you, that you would take 10 steps backward and just connect with the one person, close your eyes, and hope that you got what you wanted from their drive. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense from an efficiency standpoint, it doesn't make sense from a security standpoint, and it just doesn't make sense. And most importantly, it doesn't make sense in the context of the evidence in this case that you have before you.

To be clear, the government does not need to prove how all of the child pornography that was on the defendant's computer got there, that's not part of the

government's burden, it does not -- it's also not your job and the government does not need to prove to you why he would even want it there in the first place, and you shouldn't speculate about that. This is about one thing, one question, did he know that the child pornography in those three different folders were in -- excuse me, was in those three different folders on his hard drive and did he know that it was child pornography? And the evidence that you have -- not speculation, the evidence that you have before you leads to only one answer to that question, and that answer is "Yes, of course he knew." The defendant could not and he cannot frankly explain away one crucial piece of the evidence before you, the fact that he searched his computer for the term "PTHC."

Now there's a lot of technical testimony here, among just a few witnesses, and the character of the testimony tends to be technical, but it's not complicated. Take a deep breath. Take a step back.

And again hold onto your common sense. And it's pretty easy to navigate through it actually.

You have it in black and white. Both Special Agent Phelps and Mr. Nicholls agree that Windows 7, which was the operating system of Mr. Levin's computer that he had installed on his computer still in 2015,

stores the most-recently-opened items on the computer and the most recent searches on the computer, you saw evidence of those recently-opened files, link files, in the computer itself. Now remember a "link file" is basically just a shortcut that the computer, Windows, the system, generates to make it easier for a user, a person who once opened the file, to open it again. And I want to be very clear, the defendant is not charged with possessing these link files. The fact that these link files tell you about what was open on his computer is relevant to his knowledge.

MR. CARNEY: I have an objection to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, that's an appropriate argument. Go ahead.

MS. PARUTI: For example, in Exhibit 24, which you have before you now, you see, one, a video called "Pedo Woman and Her Doggy," that was at one point located in Alex's download folder, but at the time of the search no longer existed on the computer. In Exhibit 25, you saw another video, this one called "PTHC, Pretty Babysitter Makes Sex with 3 YO Little Girl, PTRBR Subtitle Pedo Mom 2014." That was located in another folder on Alex Levin's hard drive. Again, that one no longer existed on the computer at the time

of the search. You saw evidence of these and other link files in that User Registry Report 2, and that's at Exhibit 26.

When you go back to the jury room, you'll be able to flip through the paper copy and you'll be able to look at it as a group on the computer and go through the pages to really look at all of the sections that the witnesses highlighted for you on the stand. Remember, that this is the report that Agent Phelps generated, using his computer, that shows you, in the first section, what the computer recorded about items that the user, a person, a human being, had opened. Those items, the "link files," as we've been calling them, are ordered, they go in order. And in the first category you'll see that they're not broken down into specific file types, we just know the title of the items that had been opened, and we can see, in that first section, the most 30-recently-opened items on the computer.

You know from the testimony that each of those items is given a number, and that's highlighted here on the screen for you now, on the left-hand side. Do you recall the agent's testimony, um, that when you see the item numbers out of order, it means that they had been opened more than once? And so that when every time an item is opened, it gets a number, it goes in order. But

if you open the same thing twice, within the 30-most-recent-files opened, it just gets moved up a line, rather than giving it a new Number 7 or Number 10.

You can tell what some of those items are based on their names and we looked at these through the witnesses' testimony. For example, we know that "Downloads" and "Alex's Dots" are folders, because we saw them -- you saw them in the evidence. We know that other link files, here in this section, have names that are indicative of child pornography, like, for example, the ones including the term "falco" or "pedo" in them. We don't know what types of files they were, but we know, from their inclusion here, that they were opened by a person, which means it was up on his screen. That's what Mr. Nicholls just told you.

Now the Registry Report, which is Exhibit 26, also breaks down the most recently-user-opened files by type, for example there are Word documents, like the defendant's resume and bio, and you can go through and you can look and see all of the recently-opened Word documents in there. Some of them again you know what they are because you have them in evidence or you can tell based on their title.

For example, we also have, in a separate section of the report, video files, which you know are videos

because they have that file extension, the ".avi." It's worth noting here that even though Windows stores up to 10 avi files or movie files of that type, there are only 6 here. If the user doesn't open more than 10, or more than 6, for example, Windows doesn't store it, it's only storing what has actually been opened. In 4 of those 6 there are titles that obviously signal that they were child pornography. So where are the concert videos?

To be clear, the defendant is not charged again with possessing these link files or their target files that generated the shortcuts. The fact that Mr. Levin had opened them, however, is directly relevant, as I said, to his knowledge that other videos still present on the computer, when the FBI executed the search warrant in 2015, were child pornography, and that he knew they were child pornography.

Now much has been made about the term "Last Accessed Date" for a lot of the files that we saw, specifically the child pornography files, but one word of caution, those dates, I submit, are nothing but a distraction for you, they tell you nothing about what you need to decide, what your job it is to decide.

Access dates tell you nothing about what happened to the files prior to the last accessed date, which could be because of a system process that was run or because, for

example, somebody opened it. But it doesn't matter, what matters is that the files were there and that Mr. Levin knew that they were there.

The creation dates, however, for example in the Shiraza folder the child pornography file had creation dates of 9-24-11, so September 24th of 2011. The Frostwire files had creation dates of October 11th, 2011. And the child pornography file in the incomplete folder had creation dates of October 11th, 2011. Those dates are important because they tell you that those files had existed on the defendant's computer since 2011, a computer which he bought new in 2009 and used up through the beginning months of 2015. For four years prior to the FBI search warrant execution in August of 2015, those files were present on the defendant's computer, which is significant when you think about what his search history was.

Now I'm not talking about his search history using the peer-to-peer file-sharing program, that's not in evidence and you shouldn't speculate about what he was actually searching for, I'm talking about the specific searches that he conducted on his computer, and that's also included in that Registry Report, which is Exhibit 26, it's called "Word Wheel Query," that's the section. It's the section of the Registry Report that shows you,

in black and white, in print, what the defendant was typing in to search for on his hard drive, the 69 most recent searches, in fact, which included, for example, ".jpg, PTHC, incomplete, and Tara." And we know that "Tara," we learned from the witness that "Tara" is a name that is frequently associated with child pornography files. We know that "jpeg," "jpg" denotes a picture file. And we know that "PTHC" stands for "Preteen Hard Core." It's undisputed in this trial.

Remember, when you're looking at the numbers, again in this section and in all the sections in this Registry Report, when you're looking at the numbers on the left-hand column, if you see one that's out of order, that's because it was a search that was performed more than once within that 69 most recent searches. In addition to seeing the numbers at the left of each entry, when you're looking at this exhibit, you can also see the list sort of at the top, you can see it here on this screen. Note Items 32, 33, and 29, those are the jpegs, the PTHC, and the incomplete searches, you can see that they've all moved from their initial position within that category.

Again, we're not talking about searches of the internet, we're talking about searches of his computer hard drive. As Mr. Nicholls explained the other day by

way of example, if you want to define a file on your computer with the word "elephant," you would literally type out "elephant" into the search bar that appears right as part of your desktop in Windows 7, and the computer, once you input that term "elephant," would search all of the contents and return results that were responsive, so results that had "elephant" in them. Here, obviously, the defendant was not searching for the term "elephant."

One of the searches you just saw that he performed was for the extension "jpg" and you see that asterisk there, which Mr. Levin himself explained was one of the ways that you could do a wild card search, where anything that was appended to "jpg" would come up in your search. So knowing what we know about Mr. Levin's computer, let's look at what would have come up when he performed that search.

You're looking at the list that we have there of all the child pornography files that were found on his computer which are contained within Exhibit 17. When Alex Levin's typed "jpg" -- and we know it was him, because he was the only user of that computer, he would have seen this file, "2011 PTHC falco awesome 7 YO and 8 YO child porn 22." It doesn't get much clearer than that, it literally says "child porn" in the title.

Another of the most recent searches he performed was for the term "incomplete," and that search, we know, because we've seen what's on his hard drive, would have brought him to the Shiraza folder and it would have brought him to the incomplete folder. That's where all the child pornography was. It would have brought him directly to the child pornography.

Yet another term that he searched most recently on his computer was for the term "PTHC," "Preteen Hard Core." When the defendant entered those letters into his search bar on his computer, the computer would have responded to his command by bringing him to 10 of the 13 files he is charged with possessing.

And that leaves us with one file that wouldn't have come up just with those three search terms, one file literally sandwiched there, among the rest, with a title that speaks for itself, "incest pedophilia Lolita rape dad daughter."

This is what it comes down to. There is only one reason why this defendant would search his own computer for the acronyms that stand for "preteen hard core," there's one reason why, and that reason is to find child pornography that he knew was there. There's no other explanation for that search that makes any sense.

Now at the beginning of this trial Judge Young

told you, before you heard the evidence, that the defendant was an innocent man, that was then and this is now. Now you have heard the evidence. That evidence speaks for itself, speaks loud and clear, and common sense tells you everything you need to know to interpret that evidence. These files are child pornography, they were on the defendant's computer on August 12th of 2015, and he knew they were there. There's really only one verdict that fits this evidence and any, any reasonable inferences that you can draw from it, and that is that the defendant is guilty.

THE COURT: Mr. Carney.

MR. CARNEY: Thank you, your Honor.

CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MR. CARNEY:

Your Honor, members of the jury, I want to start
my closing the way I started my opening and tell you how
appreciative we are that you gave up time, in the
summer, for serving as a juror, especially a juror on
this type of a case, but I believe that, um, we made it
easier for you, or the defendant made it easier for you,
he states that there is no question that these videos
and photos are child pornography, it's disgusting,
horrific, and pure evil, there's no question about that,
and that's why the defendant agrees that all of the 12

videos and one photograph are child pornography. You can accept that as a judicial admission, as Judge Young indicated. None of you even have to look at the child pornography because we concede it is child pornography.

Another issue we conceded is that these images were on Alex's computer. So that's another thing you don't have to take much time to think about, because they were on his computer.

The only issue for you to decide is whether Alex knowingly possessed those 12 videos and one photograph, that's the only issue in this trial, did he knowingly possess it?

The definition of "knowingly" that's going to be given to you by the judge is contained on this poster (Puts up on easel.) Can everybody see it? The judge will instruct you that "knowingly" means the act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident. This is what the Commonwealth -- I mean the prosecution has to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt, that Alex knowingly downloaded that child pornography onto his computer. If he didn't intentionally and voluntarily download it to his computer and instead put it on there because of accident or mistake and the government doesn't prove that it wasn't there because of accident or mistake, then the

defendant is entitled to be found not guilty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now I suggest to you that the strongest indication that Alex knew that these 12 photos -- the 12 videos and the photo were on his laptop would be if he opened it. It's common sense that the reason people download child pornography is they want to view it, they want to look at the pictures or look at the videos, that's why they download it, but in this case there is absolutely no evidence that Alex ever opened those 12 videos or looked at that photograph. That is the clearest indication that Alex did not know they were there. And despite all the other evidence that the government wants you to consider, the most important is the judge's instruction that, in order to be found guilty, Alex had to knowingly possess that child pornography, and it means that the child pornography, obtaining the child pornography was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident. And if the government hasn't proven to you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that this pornography did not end up on his computer by mistake or accident, then the defendant's entitled to be found not guilty.

Now there's no proof in the evidence that these files were ever opened by Alex, there's nothing on his computer that shows he opened those files. There's no

proof that, prior to January 31, 2015, that those files were ever opened.

Now you heard a lot about opening a file and accessing a file, but we're talking here about whether Alex opened those videos, because if he opened those videos, he had to know they were there. If he never opened those videos, doesn't that support that he did not know they were on his computer?

Now on January 31st of 2015 you heard how

Microsoft indexed every file on that folder and that was
the last time that anything on that computer was opened,
which means there is no evidence, from January 31st of
2015 until the date of the search in August of 2015,
that Alex ever opened anything on that computer. He was
using his new computer.

What else shows that the government hasn't proven that Alex opened these files? We have heard about files being linked, and what that is, as both experts confirmed, is that when someone opens a video file, it automatically creates a link so that if the person wants to go back and view that file again, he essentially is clicking on the link, which takes him, the person immediately to the video. That's undisputed. It says "lnk" at the end of a video's reference title if it has been opened by a viewer. There is no "lnk" on any of

the 12 videos, nor on the photograph, which means those 12 videos and that photograph were never ever opened on Alex's computer, because if they had been, "lnk" would have been found at the end of their titles and not a single one had "lnk."

You'll find, in looking at Alex's computer, he's got an awful lot of video files in there that do have "lnk" after them, indicating he did look at those, but not a single one of these 12 videos has any "lnk," meaning conclusive evidence it was never opened.

Now the -- Alex explained to you how the pornography could have got on his old computer. He would do a disk sweep or drive sweep and bring everything in someone's hard drive onto his own computer. The common sense reason why he would do this is because he could then, at his leisure, pick up all the Grateful Dead song files, at his leisure he could look at all the Bitcoin files on there, at his leisure he could look at all the movie files put on there, and he could decide which ones he wanted to keep, and those would remain on his hard drive. In fact a lot of the time, if not most of the time, everything was left on the hard drive. Rather than taking the time to go through it and delete it, he had so much storage space on his computer, he never had to get rid of it.

indicated he was also a little lazy in not wanting to delete it, especially after he had just spent several hours looking for what he wanted, Grateful Dead tapes, movies, and Bitcoin stuff. After he had pulled that off their hard drive, he had no other reason to be on that hard drive whatsoever.

Now when you input a stranger's hard drive, you probably get things you're not interested in like an article about the upcoming spring fashion show or you get the 10 best tuna fishing boats in New Orleans. He didn't care about those things, so he'd never seen those things, but those things would remain on his computer. If he were asked, "Do you have any information about a spring fashion show going on?" "No." "Do you know what the best tuna boats are in New Orleans?" "No." "Well may I look on your computer, sir?" "Sure, I don't have anything like that." Well what would pop up? The fashion shows and the tuna fishing boats, which he didn't know because he didn't look at the entirety of the download.

How else do you know that Alex did not knowingly download the child pornography to that electronic device? As you recall, the FBI seized every electronic device that Alex had, including a laptop, two tablets, two MP-3 players, two USB drives, two external hard

drives, and his smart phone. Not a single one of these devices had any pornography on it, any whatsoever. They did a very thorough search of his apartment to see if there was any printed child pornography. They didn't find a single thing indicating he had child pornography on his hard drive.

Now the prosecutor makes a lot about that Alex is some kind of computer genius. Well he might be in the areas where he works in business applications of computers, but it doesn't take a genius to go on the file-sharing program -- heck, the first one he said he was on was Napster. Napster was a program where you could get files transferred from that program to your computer. Well peer-to-peer sharing was another way files could be brought over to your computer and Alex would sweep someone's disk or someone's hard drive and bring it into his computer. That took no genius at all.

So although he might have expertise in some ways, you don't need expertise to use file-sharing software, you can just look on Wikipedia or Google for files that -- peer-to-peer file-sharing, it will come up and it will tell you how to get on and how to look at other people's files that they want to share with you.

They're hoping you will share with them, but they are willing to share some files or all the files, and the

downloading is easy. A 12-year-old could do a peer-topeer sharing, that's how easy it is. It's like downloading something from Itunes.

And finally, there's no admission by Alex, no statement or confession he made. In fact when the agents were there and sitting with him and explaining what they were going to do, they said, "All right, sir, we have a search warrant here, we're going to search to see if you have any child pornography." His response was, "Wholly shit, you're not going to find any porn." And in fact, what he was probably thinking was whether there was any legal pornography or adult pornography on there. If someone has child pornography on his computer, don't you think there would be evidence of adult pornography also? But his response, "Wholly shit, you're not going to find any porn," tells you what he believed.

Ladies and gentlemen, the issue you have to decide is whether Alex knowingly possessed those images and I suggest the clearest indication that he had those videos would have been his opening the videos, and those videos were never opened. That is enough to create a reasonable doubt in this case as to whether Alex knowingly possessed those videos. He never viewed them once.

```
Thank you very much.
 1
                THE COURT: A brief rebuttal, any?
 2
 3
                MS. PARUTI: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: You may.
 4
 5
                MR. CARNEY: Your Honor, I meant to do one
 6
     more thing. Would you permit me to just do another 2
 7
     minutes of my closing?
 8
                THE COURT: You may.
                MR. CARNEY: Thank you. I'm sorry.
 9
10
                (Puts up easel.)
11
                MR. CARNEY: When I was a prosecutor my boss
     use to say "corroboration. Corroboration.
12
13
     Corroboration." Now let's look and see this and
14
     determine whether this corroboration is there.
15
           "Evidence that Alex opened the 13 files prior to
16
     January 31, 2015." If there were evidence that he
17
     opened the 13 files, you would have seen it, it would
18
     have been thrust upon you as the clearest evidence that
19
     Alex knowingly possessed them. But the fact that there
20
     is no evidence that he opened the 13 files means you put
     an "X" in there.
21
22
            (Writes.)
23
           "Is there evidence that Alex opened the 13 files
     after January 31, '15?" Had he accessed them after that
24
25
     date and opened them, it would have been on his -- it
```

would have been evident on his hard drive, in fact it would have links now assigned to the 13 files. That's evidence that the government could have presented to corroborate it.

If there were a link attachment to the 13 files on the laptop, that would have corroborated it greatly because if there were a link attachment, Alex would have had to have opened those files, it would have been conclusive evidence that he opened those files. But there's no evidence of a link on there.

(Writes.)

If child pornography were found on the other 10 devices or even 1 of the other devices, that would be evidence that Alex knowingly downloaded this stuff.

(Writes.)

"If there were printed images of child pornography found in the apartment." If security measures were installed in the 13 files to prevent opening by someone, such as we heard, um, password protect, or, um, cryptology, encrypting the folders. Alex never took those measures on his own computers. As he said, he had a password that a child could figure out in 10 minutes.

THE COURT: You said 2 minutes, Mr. Carney.

MR. CARNEY: All right, your Honor, I'm on the last 10 seconds.

Or any admission that Alex knew about the files. (Writes.)

If all of these boxes were checked "Yes," then that would be proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Alex knowingly possessed these items on his computer. That would have been proof beyond a reasonable doubt. What does it tell you that the answers are all "No." Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Ms. Paruti, a brief rebuttal.

REBUTTAL ARGUMENT BY MS. PARUTI:

First of all, Mr. Carney's speculation about what this defendant may or may not have thought when the police told him, "Oh, it's not about the internet, it's actually about child pornography," is not only irrelevant to your determination here, but it would be completely improper for you to engage in any type of speculation, especially along the lines that he just asked you to do. You must base your verdict on the facts that are in evidence. Obviously if the defendant admitted on the scene that he had child pornography, we would be situated differently here. That's not where we are. We have his computer, we have the files that were on there, and the other evidence you heard tells you that he knew they were there.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

To be clear about the facts that you heard from the witness stand, from government witnesses and defense witnesses alike, you know that link files are created when something's opened. You also know that that Windows registry that you'll look at in Exhibit 26, logged the most recently-opened files. It's a finite You know those files were on Alex Levin's computer starting in 2011. Lazy is not a defense. the government's burden is not to show you, to convince you, to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he downloaded them knowingly, the government's burden, which the judge will instruct you on, not Mr. Carney, is to show you that the defendant knowingly possessed them, that is he had control of them, and that possession was knowing, it was not a mistake, it was not accidental, it was not unintentional.

The defendant searched for things that he wanted to find. No one, not this defendant, not anyone, puts in the effort to look through what he had, his possessions that belonged to him, to find something he doesn't want to find. His searches tell you more than when he accessed files or to what happened to files after he opened them, and that's all you really need here. There's absolutely no reason that makes any sense or holds any credibility for why this defendant, Alex

Levin, searched his computer for preteen hard core other than to find those files that were highlighted and on the screen before you. That's the end.

(Is seated.)

THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen, why don't you just stand up.

(Jury stands.)

THE COURT: Everyone else can sit down, but the jury and I will remain standing.

JUDGE'S CHARGE TO JURY:

It's the tradition in this session of the court and in the court where I started serving as a judge that at the beginning of the charge, in a criminal case, all the jurors and the judge stand and face each other, and that's because we all stand up as you go in and out out of respect to the central role you play in our justice system. But we stand together now out of an acknowledgement of the fact that we live under a government of the Constitution and laws, and the fair and impartial application of those laws is at the very heart and core of our civilization. Under the Constitution it is guaranteed to the government and to Mr. Levin that this case be judged by judges, and that includes you, who are just as fair and impartial as the

lot of humanity will admit. And so it's right that we stand and face each other and acknowledge that responsibility. A famous judge I was privileged to know said it this way, "There has to be a safe place and we have to be it," and that's the truth. Please be seated.

Now this is the judge's charge, this is like a law school class, you must take the law the way I explain it to you, you cannot add to it, you cannot subtract from it. Let's start with the two very basic principles I started at the very beginning of the case. The burden of proof here rests upon the government and the burden of proof, in a case like this, is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. It is appropriate to use your common sense, I'm going to refer to common sense, but that's not the burden of proof, the burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt of each essential element of the case.

Mr. Levin need do nothing, he need explain nothing, he did not have to take the stand. Having taken the stand, having presented evidence, you judge that evidence just like you judge any other witness or any other evidence, you can believe it, you can disbelieve it, you can disregard it. It's just that he's never burdened with coming forward with any evidence.

Let's start now with your function. Now that

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you've got those principles firmly in mind, your function is to decide this case fairly and impartially on the evidence as you have heard it and seen it in accordance with the law. All the jurors -- at the end of my charge we're going to pick two of your numbers, they're alternates, they will go into my little office and they won't get to deliberate. Don't, for a moment, think that you don't play a very important role if you're an alternate, it shows how seriously we take this whole process because while it's rare, and God forbid something could happen, there could be a real emergency at home with respect to one of the deliberating jurors, or one might take sick or the like, and if that were to happen, we'd send in an alternate. And if that were to happen -- rare, but I've seen it on more than one occasion, I'll tell everyone, "Start all over." It's a different jury. It's a different 12. It's not 11 who have been talking about things and one additional who's to be brought up to date, that's not the way it works. And that emphasizes to each one of you that all of you together are asked -- not commanded, but you're asked now, can 12 of you agree upon an unanimous verdict here, because it must be unanimous, unanimous if you were to find Mr. Levin guilty, unanimous if you were to find him not guilty.

Now my function is fairly and impartially and accurately to teach you the law. I must go over every aspect of the law, though as the parties and the lawyers have stepped right up here, as they've candidly explained, not everything is disputed here, and I'm entitled to take the lawyers at their word, and I do, and I will point out, "Well this isn't disputed," "That isn't disputed," "and some things are disputed." But the government -- I have to accurately explain each aspect of the law. It's like I build for you a mental framework and then it's up to you to apply that framework to the evidence in this case. So don't think that because I explain everything, I think anything's been proved, I have nothing to say about it.

Now in this case I keep talking about proof, what do I mean? In this case there are four separate types of proof that you're going to have before you. Well you have -- excuse me. You have here a stipulation. Now that's something that the parties agree to, and we read it out. There's no dispute about that, it's Exhibit 16. And the stipulation is that the -- and it's admitted that the 13 video files, and they're on Exhibit 17, that they're child pornography, and I'm going to come to that, but it's admitted. A stipulation is something they agree to, that they passed in interstate commerce,

and that's what gives the courts of the United States, gives Congress the right to declare the activity a crime. So that's one source.

Another source of evidence here, though it came out of Mr. Carney's mouth, is what we call a "judicial admission." He said at the beginning of the case and he said again in his closing on Mr. Levin's behalf, "These 13 files, they're child pornography," and you're entitled to take him at his word and go no further. Though you're permitted to go further. You'll have the actual evidence before you, you'll be permitted to view it, draw your own conclusions and the like, but you can take him at his word. We call it a "judicial admission." There's no dispute about that.

Now beyond that we have, um, the testimony of various witnesses. Well certain things in that testimony, that is disputed. So what can you tell or how can you deal with the testimony of the various witnesses? I charge you you can use everything you know about these witnesses, as these witnesses testified from the witness stand, in order to decide whether to believe the witness. Your powers with respect to whether to believe a witness are unlimited.

If I've let a witness testify to something, you can believe everything that witness said. But equally

you can disbelieve everything that witness said, just disbelieve it all as though that witness never took the stand. And between those two extremes, you can believe some things a witness said and disbelieve other things a witness said. And you're not prevented from reaching a verdict here because there's one version of an event in the evidence and there's another version of an event and there's evidence, you as jurors can resolve those disputes, and that in essence — that is in essence central to your function, you can decide where the truth lies.

How do you do it? You're not prevented from reaching a verdict. I said you can use everything you know about the witnesses. So think, what is the ability of the witness to testify about those things about which the witness testified? What's the ability of the witness to know those things, to comprehend those things, accurately to convey that data to you? Does the witness stand to gain or lose anything dependent -- depending upon the outcome of this case? Is the witness a party? Is the witness employed by one side or another, and did that color the witness's testimony? I do not suggest that it does. All I say is you may consider it. Is the witness's testimony backed up, "corroborated," we say, by other evidence in the case,

the written and visual evidence, the things we've called exhibits, the testimony of other witnesses, or does that other testimony undercut, take away, make less believable what the witness testified to? So you have the testimonial evidence.

Then you have the exhibits, those things to which we gave numbers. You will have access to all of them in the courtroom. Paper exhibits we will send back to you, we have them in electronic form. The disk of what's admitted to be child pornography, you can view it, it's all there before you. And with respect to that evidence, you want to -- if you're examining it, you look at it to see, one, is it authentic, and if you think it's authentic, then what does it tell you about the case? How does it fit? Does it back up the testimony of witnesses? Does it take away from their testimony? Is it logical? Does it make sense? And this is true of the testimony of witnesses, does it have the ring of truth?

A couple of these witnesses, one for the government and one called on Mr. Levin's behalf, by background, training, and experience, I gave them the right to express certain opinions to, in essence, opinions about how computers worked, and if you did a certain operation on a computer, what would happen,

things like that, and that's appropriate under our rules of evidence.

Now if those opinions are based on facts that you believe, and I've let you hear the opinions, then you may, but you're not required to, accept those opinions. But just because I've let an opinion witness testify before you, whether for the government or whether for Mr. Levin, doesn't mean you have to believe an opinion witness, they're like any other witness, you can believe or disbelieve them or you can believe parts of what they said or disbelieve other parts.

Now in addition to the testimony and the written evidence, from all that evidence, from the stipulation, from the judicial admission, from the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits, you can draw what are known as "reasonable inferences," logical deductions, common sense. You're entitled to use your common sense. You don't check your common sense at the door to the jury room. Just remember, that's not the standard of proof, the standard of proof is proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and that rests on the government, and it never shifts.

Now what do I mean by "drawing reasonable inferences"? I'm going to give you an example, it has nothing to do with the case, and it should illustrate to

you what you can do, but what you're forbidden from doing -- because you can't guess, you can't speculate, you can't be in there saying among yourselves, "Well maybe this," "It could have been that," or "Perhaps this happened," you're not to do that. Here's an example of a reasonable inference, a simple one.

A witness testifies she's walking along beside a field of barley. Barley is what they make scotch from, there it is, beautiful standing up gray tassels on the bottom of it. And she looks out over the field of barley and she sees that the barley is lying down in an irregular course through the field. And let's say you believe that testimony. From that testimony standing alone you can conclude that the, um -- that something went through there. If it had been a savage rainstorm it would have knocked all of the barley down.

So if you believe that testimony -- and she didn't say she saw anything, but you can believe something went through that field, but without more evidence you don't know what. Was it an animal? A human? Somebody on a dirt bike? An off-road vehicle? You don't know. You cannot guess. You're not in there talking about "maybe," "perhaps," "possibly," or even "probably." But you may draw reasonable inferences, you may take into account all the circumstantial evidence. A verdict can

be based entirely on circumstantial evidence or on any combination of circumstantial or direct evidence, evidence that a person said "I did this" or "I saw that." But no guesswork.

Now let me say just a few words -- and we won't take much time, but I do want to say a couple of words about things that are not evidence, and while I'm doing that Ms. Smith will -- oh, excuse me -- forgive me,

Ms. Gaudet. Ms. Gaudet will pass out to you the verdict slips and you'll see that they're very straightforward.

First of all, I want to compliment all the attorneys who have spoken here, Ms. Paruti, Mr. Carney, Mr. Gaudet. They've done the attorney's job, they have been proper officers of the court, they have tried this case well, they have discharged their function to their respective clients. I don't say that in every case, it applies in this case, and I mean it most sincerely. Now disregard it.

You see you're not judging -- it's all true, but disregard it. You're not judging this case in any way, shape, or form based upon your assessment of the performance of the attorneys. If the attorneys helped you better to understand the case, its strengths, its weaknesses, they've done what they are expected to do. But you're not judging it based upon the attorney's

performance.

Equally important, and it is important, if during the course of the trial an attorney did something that sort of grated on you, you didn't like that, don't hold it against that attorney's client, that's not fair. I'm telling you these attorneys are doing the very best that attorneys can do with the evidence that's here before you.

Equally important. Don't you think I think anything at all about this case and I most earnestly tell you I do not, I have no view about this case. As I have instructed you, so too I obey my own instructions. I talk about the law with my law clerks, but I do not talk about the case with either the law clerks or Ms. Gaudet, or Mr. Romanow. The case is for you to decide. I'm not here to give you any clue how the case ought to come out, and I have none.

I do have this bias and I acknowledge it. I believe passionately in the jury system. I believe that you will do justice in this case. That's what I believe.

Now let's take a look at this verdict slip, and you only need one verdict slip to be returned and that's the one from the forelady, but so you can all follow along, you should have your verdict slip. And you see

I've called out in the paragraph there the elements of the charge, it's a charge of knowing possession of child pornography affecting interstate commerce. Now let me go through those four elements, but I'm going to go through them backwards, because I think you can understand it the best.

So did -- it's admitted that the 13 videos on Exhibit 17 are child pornography, so we'll assume that for a moment, but did they pass in interstate commerce? It's agreed, that's Exhibit 16, that's the stipulation. Both sides agree. There's no dispute about that. But I do tell you that so central is your role that you have the power to disregard that stipulation. But I'm also telling you everyone agrees on it, so you may take that as proven.

Now let's back up. Are these 13 videos in Exhibit 17 child pornography? Mr. Carney in his opening and in his closing he agrees that they are. You may take him at his word. Even so, I should give you the legal definition of "child pornography." You will have the videos before you, the burden is on the government, you are free to view them or so much of them as you think is appropriate, even though he's agreed they're child pornography. This is what child pornography is under the law.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any photograph, video, picture, or computer image of sexually-explicit conduct that was produced by using an actual person under the age of 18 engaged in sexually-explicit conduct. As this case has been charged, at least one of the images on one of the videos must show a prepubescent child, that is a child who has -- a minor who has not obtained the age of puberty, a child under the age of 12 generally. "Sexually-explicit conduct" includes any one of the following categories of conduct, whether actual or simulated: Sexual intercourse, including genital-genital, oral-genital, anal-genital, or oral-anal, whether between persons of the same or opposite sex. (2) masturbation. (3) sadistic or masochistic abuse. Or (4) lascivious exhibition of the genital or pubic area of any person. Here it's admitted these videos constitute child pornography, so child pornography, Exhibit 17, which moved in interstate commerce, Exhibit 16. Was it possessed? Well here's what the law says about "possession." Was it possessed by Mr. Levin, that's what we're concerned with. "Possess" means to exercise authority, dominion,

"Possess" means to exercise authority, dominion, or control over something. Possession is of two types, we call it "actual" or "constructive possession."

Here's my old judge notebook, I've carried it around for

years. I possess it. I mean I literally possess it, I've got it, I carry it around, it comes out on the bench with me. Back in chambers there, I have a briefcase, also old and battered, it's mine. Nobody goes into my briefcase, it's my briefcase. When I go back there, I can get it. I have possession over it, though I'm here and it's there. The car that I own, I get to park beneath the courthouse, it's down there, but it's my car, I can go down there and get it. I possess it.

Here in this case, if you believe that the computer or computers and the electronic devices were Mr. Levin's, if you believe that Mr. Levin is the one who used them, had physical access to them, not in any technical term, that he was the one who turned them on and turned them off and performed operations on the computer, you may say he "possessed" the computers, and if you believe the evidence, that Exhibit 17 is 13 videos of child pornography, then he possessed child -- you may find -- and I'm not telling you you must find, but you may or you may not find that if they were there on his computer, he possessed child pornography.

Now to "knowingly." The law, as has been properly set forth to you, requires the government to prove that "knowingly" means that the possession here on the

computer -- not any download, but the possession was voluntary and intentional, not because of mistake or accident. Now that's disputed. The burden of proving that it was knowing possession, like all the other elements, that's on the government, proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now let me say a few words about how you deliberate together. If you find all four elements, knowing, possession, child pornography, affecting interstate commerce, you may find Mr. Levin guilty of this charge. If the government fails to prove any one of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find him not guilty.

When you come to deliberate you all deliberate together. Now is the time for you to talk about the case, this case. And deliberations are the deliberations of all 12 of you acting together and not 10 of you talking about the case and 2 of you wondering why that person over in Vertex has the big Kermit the Frog doll over there, or stuffy. If he ever takes that out of the window, I will lose part of my charge -- or she. I don't know who has it. But it's over there. Don't look at that, that's why you have the big conference table. Deliberate together.

It's probably not a good idea, not a good idea to

go in there and take a straw vote right at the outset because you may think that if you express yourself that way right at the outset, under your oath you've got to stick with that view. Jury deliberations are just that, they're deliberations, they're a discussion to see whether 12 independent people all under the same oath who have seen and heard the same evidence and are charged with the same explanation of the law can come to a unanimous verdict.

So if your initial reaction, when you go in there, is changed by the views of your fellow jurors, genuinely changed, that's fine, but there's no going along just to bring the afternoon to an end, you've violated your oath if you've done that. You can't be 10 to 2 or 11 to 1 or 9 to 3, and "Oh, well, let's go home," you've failed if that happens. It must be unanimous, unanimous if he's to be found guilty, unanimous if it's not guilty.

Focus on the evidence. You'll have your notebooks with you, take them with you now. If you've taken notes -- and I say this respectfully, it doesn't make you a better juror, don't pass the notes around, but feel free to consult your notes. But don't pass them to other jurors, they're not evidence.

Here's what's going to happen, at least mechanically it's going to happen. We've ordered lunch

for you right for 12:00. I have to leave the building as soon as I'm done with this, I'm not going far and I'll be back within the hour. But understand that for an hour you can be deliberating, but I'm out of here for an hour at a law event. But I'll be back at 1:00, and this will prove to you I work all afternoon, so I'll be right here.

If you have any questions, write them out, I'll bring you back in here -- any questions about the law, I have nothing to say about the evidence, but about the law, we'll bring you back in here, I will explain it to you. We ask you to do justice, we cannot expect you to do justice unless you truly understand what the law requires.

When you have reached a verdict, if you don't reach it today, we'll let you go at 5:00, return here at 9:00 and continue your deliberations. When you reach a verdict, tell the Court Security Officer you have a verdict -- don't give him the verdict slip, but tell him. You make the appropriate check mark, the forelady signs it and dates it. I stop what I'm doing out here and, um, we clear the tables and everyone gets set and in you come.

And if you're back with your verdict, Ms. Gaudet will say to you "Ladies and gentlemen, have you agreed

upon an unanimous verdict?" If you've got the verdict, I imagine you'll say "Yes." She'll say "Pass the verdict slip," and everyone's watching, and it's passed up to me. And I look at it. Now I look at it only to see that it's logical. And this is a very straightforward verdict, it can either be not guilty or it can be quilty, but if it's blank, I wouldn't know what to do. If you've checked both alternatives, I don't know what to do. But so long as one is checked and it's signed and dated, I say "The verdict is in order, it may be recorded." I give it to Ms. Gaudet. She'll ask you to stand up. If, when you stand up there, each one of you is satisfied with the consciousness of your verdict faithfully recorded, then you will have done what's required of you as jurors. The word "verdict" comes from two Latin words, they mean "to speak the truth," and that's what we ask of you now, to speak the truth. Now I may have left something out, I may have

Now I may have left something out, I may have misstated something, the lawyers get a chance to correct me now before we send you out.

Counsel.

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

AT THE SIDEBAR

THE COURT: Satisfied, Ms. Paruti?

```
MS. PARUTI: Yes, the government's content.
 1
                THE COURT: Satisfied?
 2
 3
                MR. CARNEY: I renew my motion for a directed
     verdict.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: Noted and denied, and your rights
 6
     are saved.
 7
                MR. CARNEY: And also the jury instruction.
 8
                THE COURT: And I expressly refused, but again
     your rights are saved as to that.
 9
10
           And thank you, Mr. Gaudet, for bringing that up.
11
     I'm going to let out the alternates. I put the
12
     alternates in what we call a "robing room," which I
13
     think is pompous, but I have to go in there to take the
14
     robe off and leave.
15
           No objection if I do that with the alternates
16
     being there?
17
                MS. PARUTI: No objection.
18
                MR. CARNEY: No objection.
19
                THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
20
21
                (In open court.)
                THE COURT: I'm going to designate the two
22
23
     alternates and the alternates can come down to these two
24
     chairs here, and when we send the jury out, would you
25
     simply turn to the right and go into my little office
```

```
next to the jury room. Don't worry, we'll have lunch
1
     brought in there and the like. And that's where you can
 2
 3
     wait while the jury deliberates.
           The alternates in this case are Arianna Gynan and
 4
 5
     Michael Hooley. All right.
                (Two people leave jury box.)
 6
 7
                THE COURT: The jury may retire and commence
8
     their deliberations. I'll remain on the bench.
9
                THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
                (Jury leaves, 12:00 p.m.)
10
11
                THE COURT: Please be seated. Ms. Gaudet will
12
     come out and go over the exhibits with you. I will be
13
     at the Boston Bar till 1:00, come straight back, so it's
     a good time for you to have lunch.
14
15
           And the compliment was sincerely meant, I do
16
     appreciate how you have tried this case.
17
           We'll stand in recess.
                THE CLERK: All rise.
18
19
                (Recess, 12:00 p.m.)
20
                (Jury enters, 3:40 p.m.)
                THE COURT: Let the record show that the 12
21
22
     deliberating jurors and the two alternates are present
23
     in the courtroom. I've received two questions and I
     will read them.
24
25
           The first is "Can we receive the transcripts of
```

```
1
     Agent Phelps about the word wheel query related to
     explorer?"
 2
 3
           Is that the first question, Madam Forelady?
                THE FOREPERSON:
                                 Yes.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: Is that the first question, ladies
 6
     and gentlemen of the jury?
 7
                THE JURY: (In unison.) Yes.
 8
                THE COURT: I'll read the second question.
           "Does the explorer of word wheel query include
 9
     searches of internet explorer or only computer?" And
10
11
     then there's a reference to Exhibit Number 26, the
12
     Registry Report, 15 pages.
13
           Is that the second question, Madam Forelady?
14
                THE FOREPERSON:
                                 Yes.
15
                THE COURT: Is that the second question,
16
     ladies and gentlemen of the jury?
17
                THE JURY: (In unison.) Yes.
                THE COURT: To those questions, I make these
18
19
               That's the formal way of doing it.
20
           Well the first question is -- the usual answer is
21
     "No," but because we have Mr. Romanow and he is a superb
22
     Court Reporter, the answer is "Yes, but not until
23
     tomorrow," and here's why. Because I can't just give
24
     you part of a witness's testimony, I have to give you
25
     all of Phelps's testimony so you can look at whatever
```

```
1
     you want. But I have to give you the complete direct
 2
     testimony and I have to give you the complete cross-
 3
     examination of Mr. Phelps because you're evaluating
     credibility, not just answering questions. So I will by
 4
 5
     tomorrow. And you've got to figure out how you want to
 6
     proceed. You can proceed without it. We're not going
     to ask you any questions, I'm just going to send you
8
     back. You can send word out that you'd like to stop and
     come back tomorrow. That's entirely up to you.
 9
10
           The second question is a factual question that
11
     perhaps getting the first one answered will answer the
12
     second. But I'm not permitted to speak to the second,
13
     because that's for you, it's from the evidence. You're
     limited to the evidence and the reasonable inferences
14
15
     you can draw from the evidence.
16
           So those are my answers to the questions.
17
     jury may retire and continue their deliberations.
18
                THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
19
                (Ends, 3:45 p.m.)
20
                THE COURT: Please be seated. And you folks
21
     may all be in recess.
22
                (Recess, 3:50 p.m.)
23
                (Jury enters, 4:00 p.m.)
24
                THE COURT: Let the record show that the 12
25
     deliberating jurors and the two alternates are present
```

in the courtroom. The jury has indicated a desire to stop for the day and resume tomorrow, and that's what we will do. So I have some instructions for you. And the instructions are obvious.

You see now I can no longer say "keep your minds suspended," and that means that you know things that none of the rest of us know, nor should we know, you know the tenor of your discussions over the afternoon in the jury room. Therefore it becomes doubly, triply important that you not talk to anyone about this case or take it into your head to start doing research on computers or anything having to do with this case. You may only be influenced in this case, when you resume deliberating tomorrow, by your view of the evidence and the views of your fellow jurors and by nothing else whatsoever.

So you're not to talk to the alternates about the substance of the case or anything that went on in the deliberating room, the alternates are not to talk to you about those things. I'm not saying you can't talk to each other as you walk out, but not about those things.

So important is it that when you come in tomorrow -- and the alternates may come in and the alternates may be with you, don't talk at all about the case. We'll start promptly at 9:00, I'll bring you all in here,

you're on your oath as jurors, and now, in the middle of deliberations I will ask you, I'll ask collectively but it's on your oath as jurors, whether you have obeyed these instructions. They are so important, the integrity of the entire proceeding depends on it.

So with the instructions, do not talk to anyone about the substance of the case -- the deliberating jurors don't continue talking among yourselves, don't talk with the alternates, the alternates, don't talk with the deliberating jurors about the substance of the case. You may stand in recess until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

This frequently happens, that is the deliberations take more than a day. Go home, relax, come back refreshed tomorrow, and give it a continuing look as I know you are.

I will tell you, we've checked and, um, this

Mr. Phelps, he testified over parts of two days, so

we're searching out how much transcript there is. This

is a real job for Mr. Romanow, I know he will do a

superb job, but he's got to check everything to make

sure it can be certified to you, and then we have to go

over it and take out -- if there were bench conferences

that you didn't hear, we naturally have to take them

out. So there's a little process. But we're doing it

```
1
     as fast as we can.
 2
           You may stand in recess with those instructions
 3
     until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. The jury may recess.
                THE CLERK: All rise for the jury.
 4
 5
                (Adjourned, 4:00 p.m.)
 6
 7
                      CERTIFICATE
8
           I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do
 9
10
     hereby certify that the forgoing transcript of the
11
     record is a true and accurate transcription of my
12
     stenographic notes, before Judge William G. Young, on
13
     Wednesday, May 29, 2019, to the best of my skill and
14
     ability.
15
16
17
     /s/ Richard H. Romanow 06-25-20
18
     RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```